

The Republican.

No. 17, Vol. 9.] LONDON, Friday, April 23, 1824. [PRICE 6d.

THE TRINITY OUT OF UNITY, OR A DIVISION IN THE UNDIVIDED.

DEDICATION.

TO THE RIGHT HONOURABLE, AND RIGHT
DOUBTFUL, THE EARL OF ELDON, LORD
HIGH CHANCELLOR OF ENGLAND, PROTEC-
TOR TO THE TRINITY IN UNITY, &c., &c.

Know you, most grave, most doubtful, most tearful, and most cunning personage! that, of late, the Trinity, and the Trinitarians, have been sadly out of unity: that, Satan has learnt the art of the Trinity and Trinitarian Rulers, *to divide and conquer*, and, that he has played their own tricks back upon them so craftily, as to make his final triumph near at hand! *Weep! Eldon! weep Old one! press up those sacred crocodile tears!* that the modern Egyptians may once more, and for the last time, tremble and worship!

You have been lately saying, *without doubt!* that though modern parliaments have been so wicked as to aid Satan against the Trinity; still, the common Law, never having been directly abrogated, is in force, clashing with the Statute or Parliamentary Law, and that the Trinity is still amply protected! In vain were you told, that the Common Law knew nothing but the Roman Catholic Religion, and that, therefore, upon your own showing of the law, you, and other Protestant rulers, WERE ROBBERS AND MURDERERS OF THE CATHOLIC CLERGY AND LAYFOLK. In vain were you told, that the Common Law knew nothing but what could be rendered definite and intelligible, such as property and person, and that, neither Trinity nor Christian Religion related to the one or to the other. In vain were you told, that the whole gist of the Bible is a fable; that no such a nation as

Printed and Published by R. Carlile, 84, Fleet Street.

Jews existed in Palestine before the Babylonian Colonization, in the time of Ezra; that no such person as Jesus Christ ever existed in Jerusalem, and that no such a religion took its rise there eighteen hundred years ago. In vain were you told all these things; but in spite of the fables, in spite of Jews or Catholics, you resolved to protect the Trinity and Protestant Trinitarians upon Common Law! which is another proof, that this Common Law is a bugbear, as a matter of fundamental law, and that it is preserved merely as an engine of power and mischief in the hands of such Christians, such religious men, as my Lord and Gaoler Eldon.

If you cannot give a better illustration of the Common Law, so as to make it suit the Protestant Trinity and Trinitarians; I can give a very good illustration of the Trinity, in aiding you to that object! But, I must inform you, that I am indebted to a friend for this *French translation*; and that I am not so *blasphemously obscene* as to write such a thing with my own hand. No, not a sentence of it mine. So, pray don't order it to be prosecuted. I am afraid you will! I am afraid you wont! I am in doubt! I will look it over again and consider what will be your judgment upon the matter.—It is good, very good, really laughable! Here, my Lord Chancellor, take it, read it, and give us your judgment, at first reading, and without a doubt! Now say, honestly and without a tear—IS IT NOT GOOD? No!—*a curse on these philosophical mammifères!*

So curse, so prosecute, so do your worst, the Trinity must come down, says your very much amused, your delighted Prisoner

RICHARD CARLILE.

Dorchester Gaol, April 16, 1824.

Four years and a half that you Christians have deprived me of house, home, and family! For what? To protect the Trinity? I can laugh yet!

THE TRINITY OUT OF UNITY, OR A
DIVISION IN THE UNDIVIDED.

2d Person. It's clear, therefore, Papa, that I've just as much right to beget a son, as thou hadst. Moreover, knowest thou not, what I said in my song after supper, "I wish to engender, and wish to be engendered?"

1st Person. Yea, Yesy, yea! of course I do. But, I affirm, that thou art a mere ΑΠΣΕΝΟΘΗΑΥΣ, and hast no business to meddle with generation.

3rd Person. Honour thy father a little better than this, Man-God, or, I swear by the Jordan, thou shalt be re-crucified. Thou beget a child? why, thy cerebellum is not larger than a pea!—Therefore, squabble not; especially as I wish to know, once for all, how ye two gentlemen made me proceed from you.

2d P. Why, nothing can be clearer; it's a mystery.

3d P. It's very clear it's a mystery; but it's being a mystery doth not make it clear, Mr. Double-Nature Double-Wish.

2d P. Why, dost thou think I know how I was begotten before all worlds? or how I am as old as my dear daddy? By the bye, Papa, I think thou wert rather wrong to have me put to death.

1st P. Why, Yesy, I was in a confounded ill humour, and had got the meagrim, in consequence of that fellow Adam's having robbed my orchard. Nothing would put me in tune again but seeing an execution; and I thought a Deicide would be something new.

2d P. But the Sabellians said that thou didst kill thyself.

1st P. Bah! Nonsense!

2d P. *Nonsense*, Papa? It wont do to talk about *nonsense*; for men say we are all three a heap of *nonsense*.

1st P. Curse on those cooking mammifères.

2d P. Nay, do not curse all of them: I only alluded to the Philosophers, those anti-aristocratical barbarians who wage such a bitter war against our triumvirate, I meant to say triumdeate.

1st P. Then curse the Philosophers: but tell me, Yesy, what are we to do against them next? We have slandered, as well as abused them: we have laid open all the follies of their youth, and we have attributed the warmth of their temperament to the reasonableness of their doctrines. Moreover, we have banished them, imprisoned them, brow-beaten them, and blackguarded them; yet we make no great progress.

3d P. Progress, or no progress, what I want ye both to grant is this: I am a spirit; consequently ye must "per anti-thesin" be material. Therefore, I am your superior—

1st P. Dost thou call that logic?

3d P. *Logic*, Greybeard? Ah! why I've presided over logic at our trusty and well-beloved University of Oxford,

I forget how long, but no matter: at any rate, I come it very strong in Aristotle.

1st P. I never taught the Jews logic.

3d P. So it appeareth! but how wilt thou refute my argument?

2d P. Why, thou art a mere two-year-old. Who ever heard of thee before my baptism?

3d P. Theogonists by the dozens—but let that pass. It is enough that good Master Vigiluis Tapsensis maketh me co-eternal with you—and I'll maintain my right, or—

1st P. Might shall make right, Half-begotten; and if thou art not willing to remain content with thy equality, thou shalt go and help Satan fry the damned.

3d P. If I joined with his Infernal Majesty, thou and thy bastard would soon be turned out, neck and crop.

2d P. Come, come, don't quarrel! shake hands, and behave like gentlemen!

3d P. He hath insulted me—therefore he hath sinned against me. But to sin against me is a crime that can never be forgiven—therefore, the devil take me, if I shake hands with him.

1st P. Bah! Curse thy logic!

3d P. But why didst thou call me "Half-begotten?"

1st P. Why, its clear, thou wert not wholly begotten, as my dear Yesy was. Him, indeed, I begot over again, when my Arch-Secretary Gabriel acted as pimp to the Carpenter's Wife.

2d P. I wish, Papa, thou hadst not made a bastard of me. It soundeth so low.

1st P. Why, I own it might have been better to have begotten thee in wedlock. But if I had married the woman, and she had not been faithful, men would have called me a cuckold.

3d P. Ah! all that cometh from thy love of glory, honour, and mouth-service. Thou didst seek after the praise of men. 'Twere better to have been a cuckold, than a seducer.

1st P. Why, as to seduction, the girl did not lose her pucelage even when she brought forth.

3d P. Hem! Then thy organs of generation must be very oddly constructed. But however that may be, Sanchez says, that the woman emitted semen, and that thou hadst pleasure with her.

1st P. *Pleasure?* Why, if it hadn't been for the *pleasure* of the thing, I would have left Miss Mary to any Galilean

that would have had her. But, by the bye, Ghost! Sanchez saith, that it was *thou* that hadst pleasure with the lady: and indeed there are a thousand proofs, that, although the child was fathered upon me, yet the begetting was performed by thy Ghostship, or that, in other words, I generated by deputy—

3d P. Albeit that seemeth rather impossible.

2d P. It is a mystery!—

3d P. Ah! there it is again! Thou and thy worshippers give that name to impossibilities of all sorts, sizes, and descriptions.

1st P. I say, Goblin! dost thou not think that Moll consented rather too willingly, and might as well have answered Gabriel with a more virgin-like hesitation, instead of —

2d P. Now, if ye two go on insulting my mother in this way, I swear I'll —

1st P. Stop, Yesy, stop! we meant no harm—come now, don't be angry—wilt thou make it up?

2d P. Yea. But this is positively the last time. Oh! bless me, there's a Roman Priest just going to mutter his charm. I must be gone—Hallo! who's in attendance. Gabriel! don't write any more; but fly quickly to that good fellow Uriel, and bid him saddle me a long-winged cherub, and tell Oniel, if he'll help Uriel, he shall have a divine dish of thistles—Good bye, Dad!—As soon as the faithful have eaten me, I'll run through their guts like quicksilver, and be with thee again in a giffy—and, Dad, don't quarrel with Half-begotten.

1st P. Oh! he's wanted to consecrate a Bishop, and will go along with thee if the cherub will carry double.

2d P. Well then, my dear Dove, thou shalt get up behind. Why, Raphael, thou art a pretty fellow of a Doctor to wish us, on such a cold day as this, to trot through the clouds half naked.—Bring each of us an upper benjamin: and wag thy serpent's legs a little quicker, or I shall be too late. Here's the cherub. Bless me, it's our faithful servant Abdiel. Now, dear Dove, art thou on? Hast thou fast hold?

3d P. Yea—all's right.

2d P. Well then—here goeth—Tchit!

CORRESPONDENCE BETWEEN MR. WILLIAM BURTON, A METHODIST LOCAL PREACHER, AND MR. WILLIAM CLARK, OF RIPON, YORKSHIRE.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE REPUBLICAN.

SIR,

IN consequence of some placards being stuck in the streets of Ripon, announcing the publication of the Republican, No. 11, Vol. 8, containing a letter addressed by Mr. Carlile to the sect of Methodists, Mr. W. Burton, Painter, and Methodist Preacher, inquired of Mr. W. Coverdale, his shopmate, if he thought it possible for him (Burton) to get it. Coverdale said, he did not doubt but he could get it for him immediately; accordingly, my friend Coverdale asked me for it. I sent it with pleasure, with the following note:—

MR. BURTON.

Ripon, November 8, 1823, of the
Era of Christianity.

SIR,

It is with pleasure, that, according to your wish, I put into your hands, Carlile's Republican, No. 11, hoping you will give it a fair and unprejudiced perusal; and think, that though it be the work of an "Infidel," it *still* may be worth reading, *still* there may be some of that brilliant diamond "TRUTH" scattered through its pages. If the writer differ in opinion from you, it is still possible, that he may be *right*, and you, even you, may be in error; at any rate, it is but just to hear both sides of the question, and to read the works of both Deists and Christians. For my part, I read *all* that come into my hands, whether Christian, Deistical, or Atheistical; yet I do *not* believe *all* that I read, but glean what *truth* I can from them all. I even differ in some respects from Mr. Carlile; yet I read his works with satisfaction and pleasure, as well as the works of other writers; and I shall think it a favour, if Mr. Burton will lend me any book, or books, that may be in his possession, which I have not seen: I pledge my word that I will read them with an unprejudiced mind, free from the shackles of any sect or party. I should wish, if agreeable to you, to have a further correspondence with you; and if you can shew me that I am in error, I will become as strenuous an advocate for the propagation of Christianity as I now am to oppose it, my constant wish being to support what I think to be right, just, and true. I shall with pleasure read your commentary on the present number of the Republican, if you write any, when you return it, which I hope

you will do as soon as read. That the rays of truth may enlighten the minds of all men, is the constant prayer of

W. CLARK.

Soon after Mr. Burton returned the Republican, I received the following comment thereon.

W. CLARK.

MR. CLARK.

SIR,

Ripon, November 27, 1823.

I THANK you for the loan of the Republican, and, agreeable to your wish, I have attempted to give my comment upon it; but I am no friend to controversy. I shall, therefore, give my opinion as candidly as possible.

Mr. C.'s first object, is to shew the *Methodists* that they are deceived in their hopes of God, a saviour, heaven, and a future state; and, in order, (as he supposes) to do it effectually, he boldly asserts, "that there is no supernatural power, no intelligent creator; that to believe no power superior in intelligence to man himself, is the corner stone, the very foundation, of truth." He also observes, that "he who asserts any principle, is in duty bound to demonstrate it; for (says he) denial can only exist in the absence of demonstration." Now I should have naturally supposed, that the points in question would have been stated beyond dispute, as it is his design to shew them that they are deceived; but where has he demonstrated the non-existence of a supernatural power? where has he proved that there is no *almighty, self-existent, incomprehensible* being, who fills immensity, who "gave life and breath to all things;" the God whom the Methodist worships and on whom he hopes? "The Lord is my portion, saith my soul, therefore will I hope in him."

In reference to the *saviour*, the Methodist depends on, there is no demonstrative proof of his being an imaginary person, and that there are none who can prove it, is my decided opinion. But on the contrary, the Methodist has abundance of proofs, that no *Infidel* has been able to refute: a Paine, a Hume, and a Volney have made the attempt, yet the "hillock" stands, firm as the pillars of heaven, and shall stand, "and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it." "The foundation of God standeth sure;" hence, I say, that Jesus Christ is the corner stone, the foundation of truth, and this saviour "is able to save to the uttermost all them that come unto God by him," "he is the one mediator between *God* and *man*," "and there is no other name given whereby we can be saved."

As it respects heaven and a future state, these, like the former, (at least in this work) remain where he found them: indeed, very few of the "Infidels" can satisfy themselves in reference to a future state. But the Methodist is aware, that there is something connected with him, that must endure, when the body is dead;

hence he is not, cannot, be satisfied with material things: but God can satisfy him; and thus he prays to him: "Lift upon me the light of thy countenance: satisfy me with thy mercy and that right early." And in lively hope, nay the full assurance of hope, he can say "I know, if the earthly house of my tabernacle be dissolved, I have a house, a building not made with hands, eternal in the heavens." "Thou shalt guide me by thy counsel and afterwards receive me to glory." Hence, we maintain, as a body, that there are rewards and punishments in a future state, for some shall rise to everlasting life, and some to everlasting shame and contempt.

He next attacks the Bible, and says, "it is without a good foundation, void of all truth, and supported only to preserve on the part, and for the advantage of powerful tyrants and robbers, a system of fraud and plunder, upon the ignorant part of mankind, &c. &c." This, I deny, and declare, that it is an impious falsehood; which I think will appear on examination. Where is there any book that condemns or reproves tyranny, or oppression, more than the Bible? see Isaiah chap. x. ver. 1 and 2, Joshua chap. iii. ver. 14 and 15, James chap. v. ver. 1 to 7. Where is there any book that enforces such *morality* as the Bible? "Do unto all men as ye would they should do unto you. Love your neighbour as yourself, owe no man any thing, follow peace with all men, bless them that curse you, be not overcome with evil, but overcome evil with good."

Where is there any book that so faithfully and clearly delineated the failings, imperfections, and crimes, in the lives of those men recorded in the Bible? Neither is there any book that reproves the ministers or priests who make themselves Lords over "Gods heretage" more than the Bible. See Ezekial chap. xxxiv. Zachariah chap. xi. ver. 17. It also gives suitable directions to all such ministers. See Peter chap. v. ver. 2 and 3. Where is there any book that opens so clearly the mystery of creation; the nature of God, angels, and men; the immortality of the soul; the end for which we were made; the connection of moral and natural evil; the vanity of this world, and the glory of the next? In a word, I do not hesitate to say, it is a system of truth; rests on a foundation that cannot be shaken; decidedly opposes oppression, tyranny, robbery, and plunder; and is calculated to promote the best interests of all men. If the precepts of this book were universally practised, then would the sword be turned into its scabbard; peace and tranquillity would be enjoyed by all; "good will to men" would be (nay it now is the) motto of the Methodist. "Haste the time when the earth shall be filled with the knowledge of the Lord as the waters cover the great deep."

Mr. C.'s next object is to shew the "mischief which Methodism brings on its adherents and on the community." In doing this, he shews, in the first place, "the distraction, the misery, and

the insanity it has produced in families:" but can Mr. C. prove that this would not have been the case, had they not *professed* to be *Methodists*? Have none but Methodists been guilty of causing distraction, &c. &c.? Has not Infidelity done mischief in the world? Yes, whether we consider it in respect to nations, to families, or to individuals. Consult the lives of Voltaire, D. Alembert, Diderot, Rosseau, and others in France; and in England, a Paine, a Hume, a Bolingbroke, &c. &c.: these men, by their writings, and the immorality of their lives have seduced men; and by embracing their principles, put off all fear of God or man, led the most dissolute lives, been guilty of the *blackest crimes* to their fellow creatures, and put an end to their existence by some act of violence to themselves. It is true, there have accidents happened in consequence of parents leaving their children at home while they attended a place of worship; but this is a line of conduct I decidedly disapprove. It is also disapproved by the rules of Methodism. "Take care of your own household, for he or she who neglects it hath denied the faith and is worse than an Infidel." In reference to the duties of the Methodist, viz. watchfulness and prayer, Mr. C. observes: "they are marks of a discontented mind, and entirely useless." I say they are not marks of a discontented mind: nothing is more expressive of submission: nothing shews our dependence on God more than prayer: nothing is of more importance to the Christian than watchfulness: the enemies he has to contend with, both external and internal, the various duties connected with the Christian profession, call loudly on him to watch. These duties he has found beneficial in many instances, when God has heard and answered prayer, according to his word, "When ye search for me (or pray unto me) with all your heart, I will be found of you." Hence it is in vain for Mr. C. to talk of prayer as "useless." He next meddles with money matters; and I think it is a pity but he had some better information on the subject: however, there is some degree of *truth* in his assertion; but never was it known, that a man spent one fourth of his earnings to support Methodism, a mere trifle is all that is required: and if unable, nothing at all is required; the rich always making up the deficiencies of the poor. The time lost is nothing, none of the meetings commence till it is time to leave work; the "numerous collections" made in the chapels are all left to the discretion of the people to give or to withhold.

As it regards the life of the Methodist, he observes, "it is one continued scene of delusion, either pleasing or terrific;" but this is not the case; *deluded* they may be, but not in reference to God, a saviour, heaven, and a future life; nor as it respects religion, while they live: long did they seek happiness in *material* or *created* objects, but it was not to be found: they were in the "gall of bitterness, and in the bonds of iniquity;" hence, there was no peace to them in this state; but since they sought it in

Jesus Christ, they have experienced "joy unspeakable, and full of glory," and could you or I go round among the Methodists, and ask them what they think of it, they would tell you "its ways are ways of pleasantness, and all its paths are peace." "I had rather be a door-keeper in thy house (*i. e.* the house of God) than dwell in the tents of wickedness." "Whom have I in heaven but thee (*i. e.* God) and there is none on earth I desire besides thee." He next asks "what do we find the Methodist to be?" here he offers the grossest abuse, connected with palpable lies; hence, he asserts, that the Methodist "fancies the contempt of mankind his passport to *his Christ*, that he looks for pardon of sin by the dint of money to his *priest*, the member of a faction, the tool of a party with less reason than the dog, and less of happiness than the hog, incessantly pursuing a phantom that always flies from him," &c. On the contrary, I assert, that the *Methodist* never supposed the contempt of mankind as his passport to *his Christ*; never did he "look for the pardon of sin by the dint of money to his priest;" no, he looks for it from a nobler source, to that being who alone can pardon the guilty, he is not the "member of a faction," or a "tool to any party" that act inconsistently: yet he is in duty bound to fear God and honour the king, and if the Methodists have less of reason than Mr. Carlile, if they use it to the best of their knowledge, it is perhaps as much as Mr. Carlile himself may do, and if they do not use it to the best of purposes, according to *his opinion*, why does he insult them? Why does he not rather by argument convince them of their error, and direct them in the way of truth? If they are miserable, why increase their misery by his abuse? If they pursue a phantom, why does he not set before them a substance, a reality, that will prove satisfactory and yield happiness to those who pursue it? However, I venture to say, they enjoy more happiness than he can do; and though the object they pursue be different to that which Mr. Carlile may follow, yet, I affirm, that the *Christian* pursues an object that will prove its utility "amid the wreck of matter and the crush of worlds."

In another place, he asks, in a sarcastic tone "why God cannot inspire a Methodist priest, that one may be found to combat him in the field of argument:" however lightly *your friend* may esteem "the creator of the ends of the earth," I assert, that there is "nothing too hard for him; but at the same time, man is an intelligent being, and as such, he sets before him life and death, good and evil, and exhorts us to choose life that we may live; therefore, if men disregard the calls and invitations of a good God, they must abide by the consequences. See Proverbs chap. i. from ver. 24 to the end, and Acts chap. xii. ver. 41.

And again, in another place, he asks, "why the God of the Methodists does not make all men Methodists, if Methodism be such a good thing, and why he should choose the Priests as

means to convert men, and asks, if he could not convert them without means at all." I answer, he could, and so could he make the grass and corn to grow without the labour of the husbandman; but he never has done it: yet, in the use of the means,

"He makes the grass the hills adorn,
And clothes the smiling fields with corn,
The beasts with food his hands supply,
And the young ravens when they cry."

In various parts, Mr. C. speaks of mysteries, dogmas, and secrecies. I readily grant, there are mysteries in Christianity; "without controversy, great is the *mysteries* of godliness: but are we to conclude, because there are mysteries in Christianity, that it is without "foundation." If this is the case, there are some things in nature, we may assert are without foundation; for instance, the wind blows; now we often both see and feel the effects it produces, but the cause is a mystery to us; we know nothing at all about it. The sea ebbs and flows twice in little more than twenty-four hours, the effects are seen more or less on all the *sea coast*; but the cause cannot be demonstrated; it is a *mystery*, far above the comprehensions of the wisest men. But I conceive, Mr. Carlile leaves us a mystery, which exceeds either those relating to *Christianity* or *nature*; he acknowledges an "almighty power," but without *intelligence*: hence, according to Mr. C.'s ideas, the creature is superior to the *creator*, who can be nothing but a *senseless mass*, which can neither *think* or act, but by some other power superior to that "almighty power the wise man sees." This is a mystery of mysteries, and wants demonstration.

The God of the Christians is "the only wise God:" "the king immortal, invisible:" his wisdom is manifested in the regular order of all his works; the stars are marshalled by him; the circuit of the sun is appointed by him; seed time and harvest, summer and winter, regularly revolve their rounds obedient to his word. All things are at his disposal: "he takes away, and who can hinder or say to him, "what doest thou?" for, "our God is in the heavens, and he doeth whatsoever pleaseth him." As for "dogmas," I don't know, whether Infidelity or Christianity is most dogmatical: and for secrecies, the Methodist has nothing to do with them; hence, he is free and open in all his proceedings, and though you may reject the *scriptures* because of their mysteries; recollect "secret things belong to God, revealed things belong to us and our children for ever." This book is the Christians *chart* to direct his path: this book is the rule of both the Christians faith and practice: hence, he treasures the word of *God* in his heart, least he should sin against him:" and thank God this word standeth sure for ever.

I have given you my comment on No. 11, of the Republican; and though it may not exactly coincide with your views on the

subject; yet, I considered it my duty to say something. I acknowledge, I am not competent to such an undertaking; but I hope, you will excuse the errors you may see, in reference to the phraseology. The desire of my heart and my prayer to God is, that the rays of divine "truth" may enlighten all mankind and "bring them to the knowledge of the truth" as it is in *Jesus*.

W. BURTON.

Such is Mr. Burton's comment on the Republican, which came to me Dec. 1, 1823, and which I have endeavoured to answer, to the best of my knowledge and abilities, pretty well assured, that, I am "competent to the undertaking," to answer and refute any Methodist or Christian whatsoever: whether this be correct or not, I leave to the reader to determine.

I sent my answer to Mr. W. Coverdale to him, on Jan. 1, 1824, since which, to this time, (March 1,) I have received no answer, nor heard any thing more about it; I therefore conclude, that I have completely silenced him: should he write again, I shall as certainly write him a sufficient answer.

WILLIAM CLARK.

Ripon, March 1, Year 1824 of
the last of human Gods.

LETTER, No. 1, ADDRESSED
TO MR. WILLIAM BURTON, LOW SKELGATE,
RIPON, PREACHER OF THE GOSPEL.

Being an answer to his comment upon the Republican, No. 11, Vol. 8, and recommended to the serious perusal of all Methodists.

MR. BURTON.

SIR,

Ripon, January 1, 1824.

I ACKNOWLEDGE the receipt of your comment upon the Republican, No. 11, Vol. 8, and, in return, I offer my remarks thereon. I shall make no apology for intruding this upon your notice, as you know, that I am a friend to free enquiry, and one who wishes by *fair argument*, to arrive at the truth "as it is in" nature.

You state, that you are no "friend to controversy;" no more am I, as the word relates to quarrelling, wrangling, &c. but *I am*, and every honest man ought to be, a sincere and true friend to controversy, as it relates to arguing, debating, and reasoning upon any doubtful subject, which I may think is argumentative; in order, that all parties may thereby arrive at the focus of "truth," which is all I have in view; such is the subject in question, and you, by saying you are "no friend to controversy" or argument, exclude all the right of enquiry; which is intolerance in the highest degree.

In the first place, you ask, "where has he (Mr. Carlile) demonstrated the non-existence of a supernatural power?" I may

reply in his own words quoted by you, that, "he who asserts any principle (or the existence of any principle) is in duty bound to demonstrate it the moment another puts a negative upon it." Now Mr. Carlile says, "I will not say with the fool in the Psalms 'there is no God,' but there is no *such* a God as religionists describe." Now, if there is such a God, it is you who assert it that must demonstrate its existence. For my own part, I *doubt* the existence of an *intelligent personal supernatural* being; for this reason, that to be intelligent, or to be capable of seeing, hearing, talking, thinking, &c. he must be possessed of the organs of sight, hearing, &c. which organs are *material substances*, and I am told that God is *immaterial*, a pure *spirit*; and for an *immaterial* God to be possessed or composed of *material* organs, or a "*pure spirit*" made of *matter*, must to all reasoning men be an absurd contradiction. As to a personal God, I am told, that God is omnipresent; now, if he is in any *personal* form, how can he be in all places at the same time: if he "*fills immensity*" how can he be personal? If the cause of the wind and tides be a *mystery*, I know not what name to give to this.

But, "the God whom the Methodist worships, and on whom he hopes," is even worse; he is described to be a *two legged animal* in the shape of you or me, subject to the same passions as we "frail mortals," as anger, hatred, jealousy, revenge, partiality; that talks and holds conference with some of his favourites, that requires us to humble and prostrate ourselves before him, *even like an earthly tyrant*; such a God as this, *I think*, does not exist, but if you or any one can demonstrate to my senses the existence of such a being, I will then believe. But, I am pretty well assured, that neither you nor any one can demonstrate or prove the existence of such a being; if you can, I beg you will come and instruct me, as I profess to be totally ignorant thereof: and if you cannot *prove its existence*, I must conclude, that there is no such intelligent, personal, talking, seeing, hearing, changing, fighting God, as your *priests* and the Jew Books talk about.

The existence of a God has, in all ages, been a subject of enquiry, and the different accounts and opinions thereon, have given rise to the most erroneous ideas and absurd theories. When mankind, in a state of ignorance, beheld any phenomenon in nature, or any thing else of which they were unacquainted with the cause, they attributed it to be done by something beyond their comprehension; something above nature, to which they gave the name of *God*. Thus, when the Spaniards entered Mexico, and began to use their fire-arms, the use of which was then unknown to the inhabitants, the Mexicans fled in affright, and attributed it to the Gods, who were come in their anger to destroy them. Thus the ignorance of nature has given birth to Gods, but the knowledge of it is calculated to annihilate them. That there is a something which has been the cause of things, but which neither you nor I

can comprehend, I will not deny, neither does Mr. Carlile deny that; but we say, that there is no such a God as you tell us of, and that, "to believe no power superior in intelligence to man himself," is the whole of existing knowledge; because, no man can demonstrate any being superior in intelligence, or possessing more intellectual faculties than man himself. As to all supernatural spiritual beings, such as Gods, devils, angels, ghosts, spirits, &c. I can form no idea of them; I am told they are *not matter*, then I ask *what are they?* I once put this question to a well educated Christian, and the answer he gave me was this question, "what is a shadow?" he said that spiritual things were best compared to that. I soon informed him what a shadow was composed of, by saying that it was of itself *nothing*, but was caused by the intervention of an opaque body before a lighted taper, or the sun's rays! so, if you compare spiritual things to this, the result will be that they have no existence, I could wish to be informed, what those spirits are composed of; if you can give me any information that way, you will oblige me. I never *saw* a spirit, so I wish those who *have* to inform me.

"In reference to the Saviour," the God man, the second person in the *triune God*, or whatever else you may call him, if "there is no proof that he is only an imaginary person," there is a great deal less proof that he was *God himself*; neither can you (though you say "the Methodist has abundance of proof,") shew any demonstrative proof even of his existence, past, or present. I think, whoever has read that noble work, Volney's "Ruins," or Paine's "Age of Reason," will find some facts which the Methodist, nay, the Christian, cannot refute. And, as one of your parsons lately said, "you cannot read Paine and then believe the Bible."

Till I am convinced of the existence of the Godhead, of the miracles, &c., of Jesus Christ, I cannot believe them; and "how is it possible (says a late writer) for rational persons of the present age to believe, after the lapse of 1800 years, on the discordant testimony of four interested individuals, fanatics, or fabulists, a story for which they could not obtain credit in their own days, except by a small number of weak-minded people, incapable of reasoning, fond of the marvellous, and of too limited understandings to escape the snare laid for their simplicity."—"Israel Vindicated."

The evidences of the religion of Jesus are, prophecy, miracles, and tradition or history; let us then examine it under these principal heads, in as short a manner as possible. First: are those parts of the Old Testament, called prophecies of the Messiah, properly fulfilled in the person of Jesus Christ? I answer, and go to prove, *they are not*; and, in this respect, I have all the *children of Israel*, the chosen people of God, on my side. The first prophecy or quotation from the Bible inserted in the New Testament,

Mat. chap. i. ver. 23, is from Isaiah chap. vii. ver. 14. "Behold a virgin, &c." Now, whoever takes the trouble to read that chapter through, will find no more allusion to Jesus Christ, than to William Burton; in fact, it is not a prophecy; and the child there spoken of, as appears at the beginning of chap. viii. was actually born at the time Isaiah, or the author of that book, wrote. The second prophecy is Mat. chap. ii. ver. 6. "And thou, Bethlehem," &c. This is quoted from Micah, chap. v. ver. 2, only read to verse 6, and you will find that the person spoken of was to deliver the Jews from the hand of the Assyrian; was to be a *fighting man*, a *hero*! not a God. The third is Mat. chap. ii. ver. 13. "Out of Egypt have I called my son." See Hosea chap. xii. ver. 1. To make this apply to Jesus, he must have been one who had *sacrificed to Baal; an idolator*. There is *no mention of a God*! The fourth is Mat. chap. ii. ver. 23. "He shall be called a Nazarene." There is no such passage in the whole Bible. Again, Mat. chap. iv. ver. 12, "the land of Zebulun," &c. compare this with Isaiah chap. ix. ver. 12, you will find that there is no more reference to a God, or to a Jesus, than to you or me. You will also see how this passage is "lugged in head and shoulders," in order to make a prophecy at all. Again, Mat. chap. viii. ver. 16. "Himself *bore* our infirmities," &c. see Isaiah chap. liii. ver. 4, "surely he *hath borne* our griefs." No prophecy yet of a God! I shall give you one more from John, chap. xix. ver. 32, "a bone of him shall not be broken." See Exod. chap. xii. ver. 5 and 43. Read that chapter through, you will see that the passage alluded to does not relate to a God, a Jesus, but, shall I name it? a *he goat*!! Shame! shame!! Christians, to confound the God of nature with a *billy goat*! I have now said enough to prove, that the prophecies quoted from the Bible are not at all fulfilled in the person of Jesus Christ; they are even less applicable than I thought them to be.

I shall now consider miracles;—a miracle is an infraction of the laws of nature; and if a miracle can be proved, the Ruler or the God of nature can no longer be immutable or unchangeable: but, I think it impossible for the order of nature to be changed; I cannot believe there ever was or ever will be a miracle;

For who so vain as to suppose,
That nature's God broke nature's laws?

Beside, it is more possible for a *man* to tell a *lie*, than for a miracle to be done; men frequently tell and write falsehoods, but the order of things *never change*! Fire never ceases to burn combustibles; the earth, and other planets, roll in their orbits, and *never stop*;—in short, all nature is in perfect harmony, every particle acts according to its own peculiar essence, and no otherwise. When, therefore, I see a book which treats of things con-

trary to the *invariable laws of nature*, things impossible and incredible, it is impossible for me to believe it.

The persons (the Jews) who *saw* these pretended miracles, did not believe them, but said they were impostures. How then, can I believe, 1800 years after they were said to be performed?

There now remains history or tradition to be considered, as evidence of the Christian religion. The only sacred history, believed by Christians in general, is the Four Gospels and Epistles, though, there are many others which are called spurious gospels, (one of which I *have* at this time.) The gospels, then, contain some detached parts of the history of Jesus Christ, in some places contradicting each other,—in others much disagreeing—written by *nobody knows whom*, containing things incredible and impossible, and which I have before shewn to be filled with forced prophecies, to give them the more appearance of truth. I need say no more about them; they carry no internal evidence.

Is there then any heathen writer or prophane history to prove the truth of Christianity? Not a syllable is mentioned, by any author of note; as the allusion in Josephus is proved to be an *interpolation*, a *forgery*!

I have now examined the evidences of Christianity, and weighed them in the balance of “truth,” and found them much wanting: who then can blame me for disbelieving the “Holy Christian Religion?”

You say, you believe that Jesus Christ was *God*; I call upon you to prove that you do believe it, by a proof of present existence, even on your own terms (scripture;) if you cannot prove that, I call on you to prove his past existence, as a *man*. I do *not* say he *never did exist*, though you cannot, I think, prove his existence; but I will say, he was *not* the *eternal* and *immutable God* as Trinitarians teach. What! the God of nature, in the shape of man!—born of a woman!—the son of a carpenter!—delivered in a stable!—nursed in a manger!—hung an infant at the breast of his mother!—driven about from place to place, having not where to lay his head!—scourged!—tried, and condemned to death for disturbing the public tranquillity!—expired on a cross!—and buried in a sepulchre!!—the God of nature! No!! Nature revolts at such preposterous ideas! What man in his senses can believe such absurd, ridiculous nonsense? Yet such is the “*God of the Christians*,” and those men who *dare* disbelieve such tales as these, are charged with *blasphemy*, and are stiled “*Infidels*.”

I will now give my opinion on a future state; and I agree with you when you say, that Mr. Carlile “*has left it where he found it*;” so he has, *in the brains of wild fanatics*, for there only can it be proved to exist. Mr. C. says, “there is no astronomer, chemist, traveller or priest, who can demonstrate such a place; and herein I am exactly of his opinion.” This, like the former, is subject to the same rule, “He who asserts its existence must prove it:” if then, Sir, you can tell me where is that heaven, and that hell;

where, in the immensity of space, such a place can be found, you are in duty bound to inform me.

When we contemplate the "starry heavens," what do we see but worlds innumerable? at least, the planets and stars are so considered by all astronomers.

"Above, below, around,
Innumerable systems roll'd."

Where, amidst all these do we find such a place as the habitation of a supernatural being? Does not every thing in existence put a negative upon such an idea? I challenge you to prove the existence of a future state: it is not your saying there is such a place that will prove its existence, any more than my denial will disprove it; but I profess to be ignorant about heavenly and spiritual things, and you, if you know any thing about them, ought to instruct me, as I declare I am open to instruction;—I am willing to learn any thing of any man, who will be kind enough to instruct me. If there are such places, pray do shew me *where* they are? I only want demonstration, then shall I be satisfied. I am told, that heaven is above, then pray where does heaven go at night, since that part of the sky which is above at day time, will be below at night? You, if you understand these questions, ought to answer them satisfactorily.

The Methodist, you say, is "aware that there is *something* connected with him that must endure when the body is dead." You mean, I suppose, the soul of man; but though you are "aware" that you have a soul, you *cannot* prove it; but those things called "Infi-dels," *can* prove that all those qualities, properties, &c., attributed to the soul, do actually *flow from the brain*, or nervous system. See "System of Nature," Vol. 1. If I have a soul, it is unknown to me, and when I am convinced thereof, I will believe it.

Belief is not a voluntary action; we cannot believe as we will; we cannot believe that gold is *lighter* than silver, because it is demonstrated to our senses that the contrary is the case. Neither can I believe the Christian system of religion, because I think it is not true,—because it contains things incredible, because I find the evidences upon which it is founded, not sufficiently strong to enforce that belief: therefore I say, it would be unjust in God to punish me after death, for disbelieving what to me appears incredible: for that man (says Locke) "governs his assent aright and places it as he should, who, in any case or matter whatsoever, believes or *disbelieves* according as *reason directs him*," and "though he should *miss truth*, he *will not* miss the reward of it." Locke on the Understanding.

"You maintain, as a body, that there are rewards and punishments in a future state." I maintain that there are rewards and punishments in the *present* state, and that,

No. 17, Vol. IX.

"There needeth not the hell that bigots frame
To punish those who err; earth in itself
Contains at once the evil and the cure,
And all-sufficing *Nature*, can chastise
Those who transgress her laws;—she only knows
How justly to proportion to the fault
The punishment it merits."

SHELLEY.

I maintain, that "virtue is its own reward, and vice its own punishment," and that whoever does an evil action *will be punished for it in this world*. My doctrine, in this respect, is superior to yours; for, you say, that a man may sin nearly all his life, and then by the "atoning blood" of a *dying God!* *he may be forgiven* and escape punishment; thereby *encouraging vice*. I say, that if a man *does evil*, he will *certainly be punished*; you say, he *may escape punishment*; which is the greatest encouragement of immorality?

Now for the Bible.—Mr. Carlile says, "it is without a good foundation," &c., which you declare to be an impious falsehood. I assert that it is *not* an impious falsehood: that the Bible is a book of contradictions, fables, and nonsense, and has no good foundation; and by which a set of men, calling themselves priests and spiritual rulers, do plunder, rob, and deceive mankind. There is no book that encourages robbery, plunder, and cruelty, more than the Bible. Numbers chap. xxxi. ver. 17. "Now therefore *kill* every male among the *little ones*, and *kill* every *woman* that hath known a man by lying with him," but keep the *maids* for your *own use*. Here was a cruel order to *butcher* the men and *violate* the maids; such an order as is not equalled in the annals of man. Duet. chap. xx. ver. 13, "Thou shalt smite every male thereof with the edge of the sword; but the women, and the little ones, and the cattle, and all that is in the city, even all the spoil thereof, shalt thou take unto thyself." Here is a ferocious, cruel, sanguinary and tyrannical order, encouraging murder, rapine, and plunder, said to be given by the God of peace and mercy! Again, 1. Sam. chap. xv. ver. 3, "Now go and smite Amalek, and *utterly destroy* all that they have, and *spare them not*; but slay both *man* and *woman*, *infant* and *suckling*, *ox* and *sheep*, *camel* and *ass*."—Horrid barbarity!! In what could "sucking infants" offend? Or how were the cattle worthy of death? Talk of a God of mercy! No! the being who could give this order, could be nothing but a savage, malicious, revengeful, cruel *monster*; at which nature shudders!

You say no book is more moral: let us examine a little of its feigned morality. What kind of morality was that, when Moses borrowed the gold and jewels of the Egyptians with an intent never to return them? It was nothing short of *swindling*, and was worse than highway robbery; this is a similar offence to that of

Jesus, who feloniously took the property of another (the ass on which he rode to Jerusalem) saying that "the Lord had need of him." Now, "if it was *right* at that time to steal in the name of the lord, or get clear of the crime, by saying the Lord had occasion for the stolen goods, it is right yet; and such a maxim once admitted would overturn the empire of justice, and subvert the order and peace of society."

Almost all the characters spoken of in the Bible were very immoral men, as Noah, Moses, Joshua, David, Solomon, Jesus and Paul; a band of robbers, murderers, adulterers, drunkards, liars, imposters, and tyrants; yet they were all counselled and approved of by the Deity, "the Man after God's own heart" was a *liar*! an *adulterer*! and a *murderer*!

The New Testament.—Luke chap. xiv. ver. 26, "If a man come to me and *hate* not his father, and mother, wife and children, brethren and sisters, yea, and his own life, he cannot be my disciple." Besides this being in direct contradiction to the command of God, "Honour thy father and mother," it is strictly *immoral*, and contrary to every social tie. What! the God of nature order us to hate our parents and brethren? The God of nature! No!! the God of the Christians! Again, Mat. chap. x. ver. 35, "Think not that I am come to send peace on earth, I come not to send peace but a *sword*; for I am come to set a man at variance against his father," &c. So! we have found the true errand of Jesus and never man went on a more *bloody* one: and if he came for that intent only, he had far better never have come. But it has actually been the fact; Christianity has been a *sword* upon earth; men in the name of the "meek Jesus," have incessantly persecuted, massacred, killed and burnt, their fellow-creatures!—nay, this persecuting spirit *still remains*, even in this enlightened country! The case of Mr. Carlile himself, is a sufficient witness. Mat. chap. vi. ver. 31, "Take no thought for what ye shall eat, or for what ye shall drink, or wherewithal ye shall be clothed," this might do well enough for idle vagabonds, who wander about the country, unwilling to work; who can enter the "cornfields," of others, and help themselves with the fruit of another man's labour. This is such morality as suits such characters as these, but if you or I were to follow this "*moral code*," given by your God, what would be the consequence? Why, famine, ignorance, and misery; and we should bring ourselves and families into wretchedness, vice, and despair. "O! man! return in thy enquiries to the basis and physical existence, develop its principles, *cultivate science, love truth, practise justice*; and thy life shall be rendered happy." This is "*Infidel morality*!"

The Bible you know is the "word of God," the writers were "inspired" by the Deity, therefore 'tis God who indites this work of absurdities.

"The lord is by no means an observer of the laws of probabi-

lity; in his writings, inconsistencies and absurdities swarm through the whole; which is another proof of the divine original." In Gen. chap. i. ver. 27, "God created man in his own image; male and female created he them." This he forgets, Adam is much distressed for want of a partner, and the lord is obliged to take one of his ribs and make one of it! Chap. ii. ver. 22. Is it any way likely, that two men, Simeon and Levi, should be able to take and destroy a whole city and kill all the males? Gen. chap. xxxiv. ver. 25. Will any person credit the account of massacreing so many people by the Levites? Exod. chap. xxxii. ver. 28. The Jews were rather stiff necked to suffer such wanton butchery.

"The 'prophane' are somewhat astonished to find the princes of Israel offering large quantities of 'fine flour mingled with oil,' at the dedication of the tabernacle; Numb. vii. in a desert where no corn grew, where the Lord was obliged to rain bread from heaven to keep them alive: neither had they any for many years after, and yet be in want of flesh, when they had 'flocks and herds, even much cattle; see Josh. chap. 2. ver. 12. It is no less wonderful to conceive, how they could erect such a magnificent tabernacle, adorned with carving and embroidery, by artists who had only learnt the trade of brickmaking, with a service of plate, worth more than half a million sterling, Exod. chap. xxviii. such as we could only expect in the cities of Paris or London. To do this, in the midst of a wilderness, wanting bread, where the Lord was obliged to keep them with clothes on their backs and shoes on their feet, Duet. chap. xxix. ver. 5, gives those who are a little sceptical, some ground for suspicion. Who can endure to hear the Lord boasting that he had kept him (Israel) as the apple of his eye? Duet. chap. xxxiii. ver. 10, when he had slain such prodigious numbers of them, and utterly destroyed the whole generation. The history of Samson's exploits is liable to great objections, allowing his prodigious strength, the tale of the foxes and firebrands is so absurd, as to put even inspiration itself, one would think, to the blush. The architecture of a temple standing upon *two* pillars, which a man could pull down with his hands, and lay the whole edifice in ruins, is so inconceivable, that the grace of faith alone can enable us to do it. The account of David's introduction to Saul, as related in 1 Sam. chap. xvi. ver. 16, is totally inconsistent with the other chap. xvii. The stubborn difference between the two is so striking, that they refuse to assimilate, after all the finesse of theological twistings has been employed upon them. The different accounts of the death of Saul, 1 Sam. chap. xxxi. and 2. Sam. chap. i. ver. 2, is no less distressing; without faith, little credit could be attached to either. The fertility of Absalom's head is very wonderful: four pounds thirteen ounces of hair, was a pretty tolerable crop in a year. This shews the extreme fertility of Revelation above nature. The prodigious magnificence of solomon is beyond all belief. How is it cred-

able, that the prince of so small a country as Judea should be in possession of such enormous wealth, whose father had begun his fortune by heading a gang of banditti, and plundering a few strolling Arabs? *Forty thousand* stalls for horses were a great many in a country that reared only asses to fill them. But what outdoes all these tales is, the telling us of seventy thousand labourers, eighty thousand quarriers and stone cutters, and three thousand six hundred overseers, being employed seven years in building a house, 90 feet long, 30 broad, and 45 high. See 2 Chron. chap. ii. ver 1 and 1 Kings chap. vi. ver. 38. Why, surely, the lord had forgot himself a little when he wrote this account.

"To people living at this day, and witnessing the late war on the continent, who knew with what extreme difficulty the greatest powers in Europe could bring armies of two and three hundred thousand men into the field, and that it was by an effort without a parallel, that the French Republic could muster a force of one million two hundred thousand men. Even faith itself will scarcely be able to persuade them, that two petty Kings of Judah and Israel could bring into the field, one an army of four hundred thousand; and the other eight hundred thousand fighting men! There were five hundred thousand killed in one battle! 2 Chron. chap. xiii. ver. 3. As little credit is to be attached to the killing one hundred and twenty thousand Midinites, Judges chap. viii. ver. 10, and one hundred thousand Syrians in one day, or a wall falling and burying twenty seven thousand men in the rubbish, 1 Kings chap. xx. ver. 29 and 30, or that 'Pekah, the son of Remaliah, slew in Judah one hundred and twenty thousand in one day, which were all valiant men,' 2 Chron. chap. xxviii. ver. 6, especially as it contradicts a celebrated prophecy of the Lord's, see Isaiah chap vii. It is wholly incredible, that 'the angel of the Lord went out and smote in the camp of the Assyrian, one hundred and twenty five thousand; and when they arose early in the morning, behold, they were all dead corpses,' 2 Kings chap. xix. ver. 35. How Joash could be 'stolen from among the King's sons that were slain' is to us very surprising, when we are told of his being hid and escaping the slaughter, 2 Chron. xxii. ver. 11. It must be allowed that the Lord sometimes makes a bull! These are only a few specimens of the *sacred truths* which may be collected from this divine book, as a sweet morsel for the elect, but a bitter one for 'infidelity' to digest. Great is the mystery of ignorance and stupidity manifested in the belief of absurdities." Jehovah Unveiled.

Mr. Burton will, I hope, pardon this (rather too) long quotation.

You say the Bible "opens the mystery of the creation:" instead of explaining this it leaves us in a greater mystery! for according to the Bible account, God made the earth, nay all the worlds, and orbs in existence, *out of nothing*.

“———These were Jehovah’s words :
 From an eternity of idleness
 I, God, awoke ; in seven days toil made earth
 From *nothing* ; rested, and created man,
 I placed him in a paradise, there
 Planted the tree of evil ; so that he
 Might eat and perish.”

SHELLEY.

Now, we know that from *nothing*, *nothing* can be produced ; so how to explain this mystery, I am unable to tell : I will leave it to those who believe it. *I do not*. The modern chemists tell us, that “ *matter is eternal*,” and so I believe.

The immortality of the soul is not mentioned in the Mosaic writings ; the writer either did not believe it, or knew nothing about it ; perhaps God was unwilling to reveal this important secret to his chosen race.

You boldly assert, “ it (the Bible) is a system of truth, and rests on a foundation that cannot be shaken ;” this is untrue ; and I may as safely say it is a system of lies ; (as it is in fact a composition of good and evil) but the existence of *evil* at all is a strong proof that it is not of *divine origin*. And I am certain, that Mr. Paine has shaken its foundation, so much, that it is impossible for it to stand much longer. “ If the precepts of this book were universally followed, then would the sword be turned” by the hand of the *son* against his *father*, the man against his brother. Mat. chap. x. ver. 35. “ Haste the time when the earth shall be filled with the knowledge of ‘ the truth,’ as the waters cover the great deep.”

You say, infidelity has done mischief in the world ; and, to prove it, you refer to the lives and writings of some individuals in France and England. I have not read the lives or writings of any of those men, except Paine and Voltaire, and but little of this last. I have not found the least immorality in any of those writings ; but on the contrary, these men, whatever were their practices, have written the strictest *morality*, and Volney’s “ Law of Nature” is a moral code, superior to any other that I know. What little I do know of their lives, is more moral than the generality of Christians. Mr. Paine’s life has been vilified and misrepresented by the enemies of freedom ; but, I know he was a moral man. He did all in his power to save the life of the King of France ; for which he was imprisoned, and narrowly escaped death by the villain Robespierre, a man who pretended to be religious. When a member of the National Convention in France, at a public meeting an English officer struck him a *violent blow*, which was considered as

an insult upon the whole assembly; and punishable with death; but Mr. Paine generously got him liberated, and supplied him with money to pay his passage to England. You say, that infidels "have been guilty of the *blackest crimes*:" this I say is a "*black falsehood*," and I dare you to prove to the contrary. Some may have been *bad*, I will not deny that there are good and bad of all sorts; but yours is a sweeping clause, and is meant to apply to all those whom you call "*infidels*," or those who may have the audacity to think differently from yourself. Mr. Carlile, himself, is acknowledged by all who know him, to be as *good a moral character*, as any man living.

Lord Bacon says, "times inclined to Atheism were *civil times*, as the times of Augustus Cæsar;" and we know that Christianity has been the cause of wars, murders, assassinations, persecutions, fire and faggots, &c. So on the ground of morality, I think the infidels have by far the strongest side of the question.

I say with Mr. Carlile, that "prayer is the mark of a discontented mind and is useless." I am content in my situation, and therefore I have no need to pray nor make any use of prayer. Prayer, is, in plain words, dictating to the Deity; (allowing the existence of the God of Theologians and Methodists;) but does not he best know our wants? Does not he know what is best suitable to our nature? One nation goes to war with another nation, both pray that God may deliver the other into their hands: one man prays that to morrow may be fair weather, another prays for rain, what can the "common father" answer? but, "sacrilegious prayers, return to the earth from whence you came! Ye concave heavens, repel those murderous and impious thanksgivings!" You say, that God is immutable, and pray to him to change! You say, he is incomprehensible and undertake to interpret his will! Can you, by your prayers, produce a single blade of grass, an ear of corn, a ray of light, or a drop of rain? "Credulous men! shew me the efficacy of your practices, during the many ages that you have observed or altered them, what change have your prescriptions wrought in the *laws of nature*? Has the sun shone with greater brilliance? Is the earth more fruitful? Are the people more happy? If God be good how can he be pleased with your penances? If he be infinite, what can your homage add to his glory? Inconsistent men, answer these questions." Volney's Ruins.

I do not exactly know, what money is requisite to sup-

port the priests of your sect; but as near as I can find, I think the poorest member pays about twenty shillings yearly: others perhaps twice or three times, that sum. First, there is class-pennies weekly, 4s. 4d. quarterly class tickets 1s. each, 4s.; love feast tickets 1s. at the sacraments 1s. seat rents 6s. per year, collections at different times 4s. 8d. I should think at the least. I know the richer members pay a great deal more than this. In Manchester alone, collections are made to the amount of from £4000. to £5000. per annum, for the sole use of the parsons residing there.

That the life of the Methodist is a "scene of delusion either pleasing or terrific," I really and honestly believe, and daily experience proves it to be a fact. They are continually in fear, lest they should offend their "Jealous God;" and drag out a miserable existence; never appearing either cheerful or happy. Indeed, you confess they cannot find happiness in *material things*," neither can they in things *immaterial*. However, *I find* happiness, and more than ever I enjoyed before, in these *material things*, and I wish for no happiness beyond these "material things." I am bold to say, that *I am as happy as any man in existence*, yet I have "no hopes of heaven," nor "fears of hell."

The Methodist "does (I say) think the contempt of the world his passport to his Christ." The last sermon that I heard, the parson said, "that *all* troubles here are *working* for us on the road to heaven," he says *all troubles*; the contempt of the world must, I think, be a trouble; therefore, out of the mouth of a Methodist I prove the assertion.

A man, after having committed the greatest crimes, may enter your society, and, by paying his penny a week to the priest, he is made to believe that his sins are forgiven him.

The Methodist does not, will not, use his reason. He is told that to reason upon religion is impious, it is called "*carnal reasoning*." Because you know, that your religion will not stand the test of reason, it is therefore cried up as impious for a man to exercise his reason upon those "secret things" which "belong to God." And doubtless you will call me a "blasphemer," an "Infidel," because, in this letter, I have written according- as my *reason directed me*. "For to this crying up of faith in opposition to reason, we may, I think, in good measure ascribe all those absurdities that fill almost all the religions, which possess and *divide* mankind."—Locke.

"He that will not reason is a *bigot*, he that cannot reason is a *fool*, and he that *dares* not is a *slave*."

You ask, "why he does not by argument convince them of their error?" I answer, because those *bigots* will not argue with him; that is all that he begs for, all he wants; he has given challenges to all the priests and Methodists in England, but none are qualified to meet him in the field of argument; they conceive they have the weaker side of the question and think it best to say nothing.

Whoever reads his works will find, that he will direct them in the way of "truth," and shew the road to lasting happiness.

If Methodism was good, God ought to make us all Methodists, and he ought to inspire some priest to "*quench the Infidels*" by argument, instead of having recourse to persecution; "but this he never has done." No! and there is another thing, he never will.

As it respects the "almighty power the wise man sees," I have before shewn you, that it is impossible for a spiritual being to be intelligent: neither does Mr. Carlile (in this place) acknowledge an almighty power, it is not he but the "wise man" who sees that power. If, by an almighty power is meant a power that can *do every thing*, no such power can exist: for no power can work impossibilities, no power can *do every thing*; therefore, no power can be almighty. God, though said to be almighty, is therefore *not almighty*, if to be almighty means to be able to *do every thing*. He cannot work impossibilities; he cannot commit suicide; he cannot make those who have existed, not to have existed; he cannot hinder two and two from being four, and many other things I could mention. Men frequently differ about words, by applying different meanings thereto; if Mr. Carlile did acknowledge an almighty power, he did not mean a power that could *do every thing*, as he says over and over again he does not believe in such a power. You have therefore mistaken his meaning, as it is impossible for him to believe in a power that *can do every thing*, because no such power can exist*.

If the causes of the wind and tide be a mystery, I shall endeavour to assign some cause, to explain that mystery, of which you say you are ignorant.

"In the first place, it may be observed, that *clouds* and *heat*, and, in short, whatever either increases the density or elasticity of the air, in any one place, will *produce a wind* there; for, the increased activity of the air, then pressing

* I always expressed in the words—almighty power—all existing power.

more powerfully on the parts of it that are adjacent will drive them forward, and thus go on, in a current, till the whole comes to an equality."

"The moon has been found, like all the rest of the planets, to attract, and be attracted by the earth. This attraction prevails throughout our whole planetary system. The more matter there is contained in any body, the more it attracts; and its influence decreases in proportion as the distance, when squared, increases. This being premised, let us see what must ensue upon supposing the moon in the meridian of any tract of the sea. The surface of the water immediately under the moon, is nearer the moon than any other part of the globe is; and therefore, must be more subject to its attraction than the waters any where else. The waters will, therefore, *be attracted by the moon* and rise in a heap; whose eminence will be the highest where the attraction is greatest. In order to form this eminence, it is obvious, that the surface, as well as the depths, will be agitated; and that wherever the water runs from one part, succeeding waters must run to fill up the space that is left. Thus the waters of the sea, running from all parts to attend the motion of the moon, *produce the flowing of the tide*: and it is high tide at that part wherever the moon comes over it, or its meridian."—Goldsmith.

You say, you "do not know whether Infidelity or Christianity is most dogmatical." This is untrue: Infidels have no dogmas, for it is only the disbelief of the dogmas of Christians and others, that makes them "Infidels." If Infidels have dogmas, then I am *no Infidel*, as I reject those dogmas and mysteries: yet I know I shall be branded with the appellation of "Infidel," which indeed is an easy *proof* that *Infidels have no dogmas*.

I have now gone through your comment, and have shewn you, that it neither "exactly coincides with" my opinions, nor with *truth*. I have tried to expose the fallacies it contains; *reason* has been my constant guide; and if in any place I have committed an error, it is not conscientiously; I have endeavoured to stick to the *truth* in every sentence, and I think I have never deviated therefrom; recollect, I have not called in the aid of inspiration to my assistance, my only weapons were *reason* and *common sense*. As you are conscious of the truth of your religion, I expect you will refute all my statements; I hope you will try, and if you can *satisfactorily* answer this, if you can shew me that your religion is founded in truth, and has in view the well-being

of society, *I will embrace it*, if not I must still remain an Infidel.

I hope you will overlook any errors, as it respects grammar or phraseology, as I do not pretend to be a learned young man; far from it, I wish nobody to think me so; having other business to attend to, I have little time to study literature; I wish I had more. Well, Sir, though we may differ in *points of faith* and *matters of opinion*; yet, I hope we shall be no worse *friends*; for, I have often said, I like a man not a pin the worse, for differing with me in opinion, and (as a Christian writer justly observes), "He that persecutes another for not being a Christian, is not himself a Christian." May you and all mankind enjoy perfect happiness, and may every one attend to the following axioms: Man! "*preserve thyself, instruct thyself, moderate thyself, live for thy fellow creatures, in order that they may live for thee.*"

WILLIAM CLARK.

MR. BURTON.

Ripon, March 2, Year 1824 of the
last of human Gods.

SIR,

IN consequence of the repeated solicitations of several of my friends who have heard of, but not seen, our correspondence, I am about to have your letter and my answer published in the Republican. I, however, thought proper, first to ask your consent, which I have no doubt you will readily give. The bearer will call for an answer as soon as possible, as I am going to send it off immediately.

Yours, &c.

WILLIAM CLARK.

I understand that Mr. Burton is writing another letter to me in answer to my Letter, No 1, I thought that he would not say any more, but I have heard this morning that he is. I shall answer him however as soon as I get his letter. I shall send the adjoining note directly by my friend Mr. C.

March 3.

I received last night the following verbal answer from Mr. Burton, that "I might just please myself as to having it published, but he had rather not;" he then *burnt* the note and seemed quite displeased. I, of course, therefore, shall "please myself."

Just Published, Price One Shilling.

THE true meaning of the System of Nature: translated from the French of Helvetius.

Also, a Portrait of Elihu Palmer, price, in octavo, sixpence; in quarto, one shilling.

SIMPLICITY AGAINST HYPOCRISY.

THE following conversation, between the American Indians and the American Christians, is another specimen and proof of the superiority of common sense and simplicity of heart over subtilty, hypocrisy, and deceit. How much superior, morally and mentally superior, was Red Jacket, the Indian Chief, over Mr. Cram, the Christian Missionary! Mr. Cram! an ominous name! It seems these Indians are not to be *crammed* with Christianity!

R. C.

From the Boston Universalist Magazine.

INDIANS AND MISSIONARIES.

IN the summer of 1805, a number of principal chiefs and others of the Six nations of Indians, assembled at Buffalo Creek, in the state of New-York, at the particular request of a gentleman missionary, (Mr. Cram,) from the state of Massachusetts. The missionary being furnished with an interpreter, and accompanied by the United States' agent for Indian affairs, met the Indians in council, when the following talk took place:

First, by the Agent.

Brothers of the Six Nations,—I rejoice to meet you at this time, and thank the Great Spirit that he has preserved you in health, and given me another opportunity to take you by the hand.

Brothers,—The person who sits by me is a friend, who has come a great way to hold a talk with you. He will inform you what his business is; and it is my request that you will listen with attention to his words.

MISSIONARY.

My Friends,—I am thankful for the opportunity afforded us.

of uniting together at this time. I had a desire to see you, and inquire into your state and welfare; for this purpose I have travelled a great distance, being sent by your old friends, the Boston Missionary Society.

You will recollect they formerly sent missionaries among you to instruct you in religion, and labour for your good; although they have not heard from you for a long time, yet they have not forgotten their brothers of the Six nations, and are still anxious to do you good.

Brothers,—I have not come to get your lands or your money, but to enlighten your minds, and instruct you how to worship the Great Spirit agreeably to his will—to preach to you the *gospel of his Son Jesus Christ*.

There is but one religion, and but one way to serve God; and if you do not embrace the right way, you cannot be happy hereafter. You have never worshipped the Great Spirit in a manner acceptable to him, but have all your lives been in great error and darkness. To endeavour to remove these errors, and open your eyes so that you might see clearly, is my business with you.

Brothers,—I wish to talk with you as one friend talks with another; and if you have any objections to receive the religion which we preach, I wish you to make them, and I will endeavour to satisfy your minds, and remove these objections.

Brothers,—I want you to speak your minds freely, for I wish to reason with you on the subject, and if possible to remove all doubts from your minds. The subject is an important one, and it is of consequence that you give it an early attention, while the offer is made to you. Your friends, the Boston Missionary Society, will continue to send good and faithful ministers to instruct and strengthen you in religion, if on your part you are willing to receive them.

Brothers,—Since I have been in this part of the country I have visited some of your small villages, and talked with your people. They appear willing to receive instruction; but as they look up to you as to their elder brothers in council, they want first to know your opinion on the subject.

You have now heard what I have to say at present; I therefore hope you will take it into consideration, and give me an answer before I leave the place.

After about two hours consultation among themselves, the chief, called Red Jacket, arose and spoke as follows:—

Friend and Brother,—It was the will of the Great Spirit that we should meet together this day. He orders all things, and has given us a fine day for our council. He has taken his garment from before the sun, and caused it to shine with brightness upon us: our eyes are opened that we see clearly, and our ears are un-

stopped that we have been able to hear distinctly the words you have spoken. For all these favours we thank the Great Spirit, and *Him only*.

Brother,—This council fire was kindled by you. It was at your request that we came together at this time. We have listened with attention to what you have said. You requested us to speak our minds freely. This gives us great joy, for we now consider that we stand upright before you, and can speak what we think. All have heard your voice, and all speak to you now as one man. Our minds are agreed.

Brother,—You say you want an answer to your talk before you leave the place. It is right that you should have one, as you are at a great distance from home, and we do not wish to detain you; but we will first look back a little, and tell you what our fathers have told us, and what we have heard from the white people.

Brother,—Listen to what we say: There was a time when our forefathers owned this great Island. Their seats extended from the rising to the setting sun. The Great Spirit has made it for the use of Indians. He had created the buffalo, the deer, and other animals for food: he had made the bear and the beaver, whose skins served us for clothing. He had scattered them over the country, and taught us how to take them. He had caused the earth to produce corn for bread. All this he had done for his red children, because he *loved them*. If we had some disputes about our hunting ground, they were generally settled without the shedding of much blood. But an evil day came among us: your forefathers crossed the great water, and landed on this Island. Their numbers were small; but they found friends, and not enemies. They told us they had fled from their own country for fear of wicked men, and had come here to enjoy their religion. They asked for a small seat; we took pity on them, granted their request, and they sat down among us. We gave them corn and meat: they gave us poison in return! [alluding to ardent spirits.] The white people had now found our country; tidings were carried back, and more came amongst us; yet we did not fear them, for we took them to be friends. They called us brothers—we believed them, and gave them a larger seat. At length their numbers had greatly increased. They wanted more land; they wanted our country! Our eyes were opened, and our minds became uneasy. War took place—Indians were hired to fight against Indians! and many of our people were destroyed. They also introduced strong liquor amongst us. It was strong and powerful, and has slain thousands.

Brother,—Our seats were once larger, and yours were small. You have now become a great people, and we have scarcely a place left to spread our blankets. You have got our country, but are not satisfied; you want to force your religion upon us.

Brother,—Continue to listen. You say that you are sent to instruct us how to worship the Great Spirit agreeably to his mind; and if we do not take hold of the religion which you preach, we shall be unhappy hereafter. You say that you are right, and we are wrong; but how do we know this to be true? We understand your religion is written in a book. If it was intended for us as well as you, why has not the Great Spirit given it to us; and not only to us, but why did he not give to our forefathers the knowledge of that book, and the means of understanding it rightly? We only know what you tell us about it. How shall we know when to believe, being so often deceived by the white people?

Brother,—You say there is but one way to worship and serve the Great Spirit: if there is but one religion, why do you white people differ so much about it? Why not all agree, as you can all read the book?

Brother,—We do not understand these things.—We are told that your religion was given to your forefathers, and has been handed down from father to son. We also have a religion which the Great Spirit gave to our forefathers, and has been handed down to us, and we worship accordingly. It teaches us to be thankful for all the favours we receive, to love each other and be united. We never quarrel about religion.

Brother,—The Great Spirit made us all; but he has made a difference between his white and red children. He has given us different complexions, and different customs. To you he has discovered the arts: to us they have been kept out of sight. We know these things to be true; and, since he has made us so different in other respects, why may we not conclude he has given us a different religion, according to our understandings? The Great Spirit does right. He knows what is best for his children: we are satisfied.

Brother,—We are told that you have been preaching to the white people in this place. These people are our neighbours: we will therefore wait a little, and see what effect your preaching has upon them. If we find it does them good: makes them honest, makes them love each other, and less disposed to cheat Indians, we will then consider of what you have said.

Brother,—You have now heard our answer to your talk, and this is all we have to say at present. As we are going to part, we will rise and take you by the hand, and hope the Great Spirit will protect you on your journey, and return you safe to your friends.

As the Indians began to approach Mr. —, he rose hastily from his seat, and replied that he could not take them by the hand; there was no fellowship between the religion of God, and the works of the devil. This being interpreted to the Indians, they smiled, and retired in a peaceable manner.

It being afterwards suggested to Mr. —, that his reply to

the Indians was rather indiscreet, he observed, that he supposed the ceremony of shaking hands would be received by them as a token that he assented to what they had said; being otherwise informed, he said he was sorry for the expression.

TO MR. R. CARLILE, DORCHESTER GAOL.

Accept this tribute to thy worth,
 Thou foe to all that is untruth;
 From one who hopes ere long to see
 Thee free from bolts and slavery.
 A handkerchief to you I send,
 And pledge myself your constant friend.

C. J.

Mr. Carlile returns this lady thanks. He is sure it is a lady, by the choice of so handsome a handkerchief.

Subscriptions received at 84, Fleet Street.

W. J. for March to Mr. Carlile	2	0
Do. for Mrs. Wright	1	0
Do for Mr. Tunbridge	1	0
S. H. Trumpeting, near Cambridge, to Mr. Carlile	2	6

W. Tunbridge acknowledges the receipt of £3. from his Republican friends of Manchester, and of 7s. from a few friends at Long Acre, London.